



## **FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

### **HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE**

*December 6, 2016*

*Pasco, WA*

#### **Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Opening.....	1
Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement Planning Meeting .....	2
Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement Plan.....	5
Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement Survey Results.....	6
Committee Discussion: Improving Public Involvement and Engagement .....	8
Tri-Party Agreement Milestone Change Package Response to Comment Summary .....	10
HAB Member Self-Assessments .....	11
Next Steps .....	13
Attachments .....	14
Attendees .....	15

*This is only a summary of issues and actions discussed at this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of represented ideas or opinions, and it should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.*

#### **Opening**

Liz Mattson, Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) chair, welcomed committee members and introductions were made. The committee adopted the September 2016 PIC meeting summary following the incorporation of minor edits.

Kristin Holmes, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Richland Operations Office (RL), said that new applications for Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) members would be sent out soon. She requested that these applications be sent back to her by January 21, 2017.

### **Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement Planning Meeting**

Dieter Bohrmann, North Wind – supporting DOE Office of River Protection (ORP), opened the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Planning meeting. Dieter provided attendees with a copy of the [TPA Public Involvement Calendar updated for December 2016](#)<sup>1</sup>. Dieter highlighted changes to the format of the calendar, and he noted that TPA agencies hoped that the new coloration and included information helped explain how public involvement opportunities at Hanford were associated with the various regulatory frameworks that govern cleanup in response to HAB member comments. Dieter encouraged PIC members to reach out with thoughts on the updated calendar layout.

Using the information highlighted on the calendar as a guide, Dieter provided Board members with an overview of upcoming public comment opportunities, planned advisory board meetings, and informational resources. Opportunities for public comment include:

- An ongoing comment period regarding proposed modifications to the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant Dangerous Waste Permit for the Effluent Management Facility's (EMF) secondary containment system
- An upcoming comment period regarding an Evaluation Engineering/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) to assess removal action alternatives for the Reduction-Oxidation Plant (REDOX) Complex
- Anticipated upcoming comment periods on (but not limited to):
  - Additional EE/CAs associated with the B Plant Complex and the Plutonium Uranium Extraction Plant (PUREX) Complex
  - Modifications to Hanford permits associated with the Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste (DFLAW) system
  - Modifications to Hanford permits associated with 300 Area Process Trenches and the 183-H Solar Evaporation Basin
  - Modifications to TPA milestones related to closure plans for single-shell C-Farm tanks
- An anticipated State of the Site meeting and an anticipated Hanford budget meeting in spring 2017

Dieter noted that the Public Involvement calendar's holding bin provides a snapshot of upcoming comment activities, but he recognized that it is not a comprehensive look at all upcoming opportunities

---

**Attachment 1:** Tri-Party Agreement Agencies Public Involvement Calendar – Fiscal Year 2016 (December 2016)

for public comment across Hanford. He noted that TPA agency representatives work to incorporate those items that have the greatest time certainty and/or the most public interest associated with them.

Emy Laija, U.S Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said that Ecology is working on authoring the response to comment for the 100 D/H Area Proposed Plan Record of Decision (ROD). Emy noted that EPA is very hopeful that the ROD would be completed and signed at the end of January 2017.

***Committee Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C)***

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.*

**Q.** What facilities will be covered by the REDOX complex EE/CA?

*R. [RL] There are three or four facilities examined by the EE/CA. The EE/CA does not cover the entire REDOX complex, nor does it cover the canyon itself. The EE/CA will seek to mitigate some health hazards before a closure plan is set.*

**Q.** How are EE/CAs related to or associated with Proposed Plans?

*R. [EPA] Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), there are both remedial actions (Proposed Plans and RODs) and removal actions (EE/CAs). Removal actions are usually for shorter time frames and they are usually intended to address urgent, time-critical needs. In some removal actions, there is the opportunity to incorporate a public comment period into the removal action process. An EE/CA is similar to a proposed plan, except smaller and quicker.*

**Q.** Will EE/CAs inform or contribute to the creation of future Proposed Plans?

*R. [EPA] Removal actions generally address earlier actions in advance of a remedial action process, through which a Proposed Plan and a ROD would be created. In the case of the REDOX complex, the EE/CA process will allow DOE to begin addressing some of the earlier contamination, but the TPA agencies anticipate that a ROD will eventually be created for the site.*

**Q.** Were any EE/CAs authored for the 100 Area sites?

*R. [EPA] EE/CAs have been used throughout the Hanford Site, in many cases to address buildings. In Hanford's 100 Area, many early cleanup projects were addressed through interim decision, which are remedial processes that create interim RODs.*

**Q.** The demolition of the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) was accomplished under an EE/CA. Will PFP eventually have a Proposed Plan?

*R. [EPA] Once PFP facilities are demolished to slab-on-grade, any remaining sub-grade waste sites will be incorporated into the WA-1 and the IS-1 Operable Units. The Proposed Plan for these operable units would then address the remaining sub-grade PFP waste sites, and cleanup would then be a remedial action.*

C. It would be great to incorporate more information on the EE/CA process on the back page of the TPA Public Involvement Calendar to help the public become better oriented with the fundamentals for this process.

C. On the back of the calendar, it would also be helpful to include a brief definition of the different kinds of waste classifications, including hazardous waste, mixed waste, dangerous waste, etc.

Q. [ORP] At the September Tank Waste Committee meeting, TPA agencies walked through the permit changes and associated comment opportunities necessary to get DFLAW running by 2022. There are facilities regulated under the state's Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Hanford Permit that will need permitting actions (e.g. EMF at the Low-Activity Waste facility). Agencies are working together to consider strategies for streamlining this complex process. Ideas currently include combining meetings, adopting boilerplate language, and/or a process logo to help orient the public to the process and then highlight a specific activity within the overall process. TPA agencies anticipate that these actions will be starting soon and will continue throughout the following 18 months. Do PIC members have any thoughts or comments to help agencies plan this strategy?

*R. There are anticipated to be several key public comment periods over the life of the DFLAW initiative. From the Washington Department of Ecology's (Ecology) perspective, some comments need to be heard and responded to before other permitting actions can happen. The DFLAW initiative will likely move to the public in a way that is very confusing and repetitive. The PIC may want to consider authoring a white paper and a flow chart to provide input on this process. There will also be key points within the DFLAW public process where the Board will want to provide advice as well. It will be challenging for the HAB to provide this input due to the timing of Board meetings.*

*R. RCRA permit modifications can be challenging to map out. TPA agencies need to clarify information, make it clear how the input process is happening, why it is happening, and how the public can influence the process.*

*R. The HAB's scheduled committee meeting placeholders in January 2017 may be an opportunity for Board members to begin considering a white paper or alternative product.*

*R. The Board needs to be cautious to not become mired in the details of the DFLAW permitting process—which will be incredibly complex—and instead focus on the bigger picture. Upcoming conversations should provide an opportunity for the HAB to consider the overall framework and apply HAB priorities to these actions on how to better involve the public.*

*R. An initial step in this work is to revisit the HAB's 2010 work on the RCRA permit. There are already Board resources that exist that may provide a foundation to future efforts.*

*R. Boilerplate language that can help orient the public to the overall process at each different stage is a good idea. Having visual markers (such as logos) that could act as signposts throughout the process is also a good idea. The 'baseball cards' created by Ecology during the RCRA permit update is a concept that can be revisited for DFLAW, as well.*

Attendees thanked TPA representatives for the information, and agency representatives closed the TPA Public Involvement Planning meeting.

- Liz identified that an issue manager group may wish to convene a January meeting to discuss DFLAW permitting strategies with agency staff. Liz identified herself, Jean Vanni, Dirk Dunning, Susan Leckband, and Don Bouchey as topic issue managers.

### **Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement Plan**

Alissa Cordner, public-at-large, introduced the TPA Public Involvement Plan, noting that TPA agencies were hopeful that PIC members could review the document and determine if there were any additional opportunities to make minor logistic and stylistic edits to the document.

Emy Laija, EPA, explained the TPA agency's intentions for the current suite of updates to the TPA Public Involvement Plan. Emy noted that parts of the document had become outdated since the last substantive update in 2012. TPA agencies were hopeful that the Board could help them to verify that information included in the Public Involvement Plan was current and identify whether any layout updates would be helpful. She recognized that the Public Involvement Plan updates were anticipated to be minor, and as such, the process for updating the Plan was informal and would not require a designated public comment opportunity. She noted that a deeper future review of the document was possible but that it was not planned now.

Several PIC members provided verbal and written comments on the TPA Public Involvement Plan to TPA representatives including:

- Incorporate language into the Plan that more clearly outlines how the plan itself is updated
- Ensure that the plan recognizes that technical information should be made approachable but not be oversimplified
- Clarify language to better encourage regional HAB meetings
- Clarify wording in the Frequently Asked Questions portion (still refers to a Community Relations Plan)
- Revisit the wording of the bullets on page 5, under *Importance of Public Involvement*, to make the wording more accurate
- Better distinguish TPA annual surveys from those surveys collected at public meetings and workshops

### ***Committee Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C)***

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.*

C. Many regulations that govern Hanford cleanup only provide subjective suggestions as to how often and how much the public should be involved in decision-making. The TPA Public Involvement Plan should be very detailed, like other plans from DOE Office of Environmental Management Sites. TPA agencies should review these plans from other sites or for other agencies, like the U.S. Air Force, and consider incorporating ideas from them into the TPA Public Involvement Plan.

C. The TPA agencies should be careful that they do not historicize tribal rights in the language used in the Public Involvement Plan and other Hanford documents.

*R. The Board needs to be careful to not speak on behalf of the tribes, as they have dedicated processes for coordinating with TPA agencies.*

C. If PIC members feel that the TPA Public Involvement Plan requires a more substantive update, the committee could recommend this through advice. There is a difference between information sharing and engagement, and that distinction may need to be developed in a future version of the plan.

Committee members thanked TPA agency representatives for the opportunity to review the TPA Public Involvement Plan.

- Emy encouraged PIC members to submit any additional suggested edits to the TPA Public Involvement Plan to the HAB's facilitation team by the end of December 2016.

### **Tri-Party Agreement Public Involvement Survey Results**

Helen Wheatley, Heart of America Northwest, provided PIC members with background information on the annual TPA Public Involvement Survey and discussion framing questions<sup>2</sup>. Helen noted that the survey, which is distributed online in the early part of the calendar year, could potentially be improved in the future. She highlighted survey design, sample size, and post-survey data management as some survey strategies that the TPA agencies could examine moving forward.

#### *Regulator Perspective*

Ginger Wireman, Ecology, noted that the number of responses to the TPA Public Involvement Survey has increased in recent years, especially after the survey was changed to an online format. She highlighted challenges associated with getting the survey distributed, especially following loss of Washington State Public Participation Grant (PPG) funding. She requested that PIC members submit ideas for ways that TPA agencies could potentially distribute future Public Involvement Surveys to new audiences.

Emy Laija, EPA, said that the TPA agencies may work in the future to distribute surveys that work to gather feedback for specific, individual public meetings.

Dieter Bohrmann, North Wind – supporting ORP, noted that PIC members helped to craft an update to the TPA Public Involvement Survey following the 2012 revision of the TPA Public Involvement Plan. He

---

**Attachment 2:** Hanford Public Involvement Survey, background and framing questions (December 6, 2016)

said that response rates have been on the rise every year since the 2012 redesign, in large part thanks to groups who distribute the survey to their members.

***Committee Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C)***

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.*

C. Surveys need to take into account the people who do not know anything about the Hanford Site. Current survey strategies—both the annual Public Involvement Survey and those distributed at individual meetings and workshops—do not capture this demographic. Reaching out to this segment of the public would provide very valuable information.

*R. The current survey format is very technical, and it is not approachable to those who do not have a base understanding of Hanford.*

*R. The initial question on an online survey could be something very simple, such as “have you heard of Hanford?” Then, depending on how the respondent answers, the survey could work to present basic information about the site and capture useful information.*

*R. Different strategies could be explored to help capture the attention of those not familiar with the Hanford Site (e.g. “guess your age/education/degree based on how much you know about the Hanford Site”).*

C. So many people in Washington do not know about the Hanford Site and the ongoing cleanup. It underscores the importance of incorporating information into the state’s education curriculum.

C. For the annual TPA Public Involvement Survey, the response rates may be increasing in recent years; however, the demographic information provided by respondents demonstrates that there are many communities in the Northwest that the survey is not reaching.

C. To help distribute the survey and get the most responses possible, Board members should encourage their constituencies to participate.

C. There may be opportunity for TPA agencies to form partnerships with local universities that may be interested in assisting with effective survey design and have expertise in the practice. The Portsmouth/Paducah Site gave over \$2 million to the Ohio State University to design and conduct a robust survey requesting feedback on long-term stewardship concerns at the Site. There may be strategic partnerships that the Hanford Site could form with universities that could help to accomplish this work for less money.

*R. Is there any funding that would be available through the overall EM Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) budget? Strong, valid public involvement surveys would be useful to all SSABs.*

*R. It is important to keep questions in the annual TPA Public Involvement Survey throughout the years so that responses can be compared to one another.*

C. Surveys have not been distributed at recent public meetings, and the agencies should reintroduce them at future events.

R. Public meeting surveys should only be one tool used to gather feedback. Agency staff can also ask for verbal feedback following the meeting. It could be very simple—just enough to provide TPA agencies with a sense of strategies and meeting formats that work for the public.

Helen thanked PIC members and TPA agency representatives for their discussion. She underscored the importance of having an effective tool to measure the success of public involvement efforts. She recommended that PIC members continue working to clarify a white paper of the topic Hanford Public Involvement Survey, potentially expanding the scope of the white paper to encompass strategies for enhancing public involvement and examining the evaluation section of the PIP.

- PIC members recommended setting aside two to three hours of time to review the draft white paper to assist them in discussing strategies for enhancing public involvement, reviewing potential Board products based on the discussion and recommending near-term and long-term steps for the agencies to take at the committee's next meeting on February 28, 2016.

### **Committee Discussion: Improving Public Involvement and Engagement**

Liz Mattson provided members with a handout detailing background information and framing questions<sup>3</sup> for overall public involvement and engagement at the Hanford Site. She requested that the group highlight examples of successful and unsuccessful instances of public involvement at Hanford.

PIC members provided the following past meetings and meeting attributes that they considered to be successful:

- A public meeting for the creation of the Manhattan Project National Historical Park included a room with flipchart stations spread throughout the space. A staff person was available at each station to record thoughts and confirm that they accurately captured feedback. This provided good interactions between attendees and staff and encouraged useful feedback. Staff at these meetings were able to present both the negative and the positive aspects of the effort, and provided follow-up responses to outstanding questions. The meeting represented effective relationship-building between agency staff and the public.
- At a River Corridor workshop in Seattle, smaller discussion groups and available subject matter experts led to useful discussions.
- At public meetings about end-states several years ago, small group discussions were very useful. Some Board members had the opportunity to lead some of these small group discussions.
- The best public meetings are generally those where there is a DOE champion for the topic and a genuine commitment to implement some of the constructive public feedback moving forward.

---

**Attachment 3:** Public Involvement Information and Engagement IM Group, background and framing questions



- It is helpful at public meetings to hear agency staff recognize that they do not know all of the answers, but that they will commit to figuring out the right answers. This helps the presented information feel more genuine.
- A meeting hosted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers incorporated a station where computers were available with surveys pre-loaded on them. Meeting participants could input outstanding questions/comments into the computer survey, as well.
- Meetings or processes that integrate content that effectively orients the meeting or opportunity within an overall process.

PIC members also provided examples of past meetings and meeting attributes that they considered to be unsuccessful:

- Annual Hanford budget meetings are often filled with information that is confusing, incomplete, and challenging to approach.
- The public meetings associated with the revisions of the Site-wide RCRA permit were very confusing, despite the good preparations that went into planning them.
- It is often very challenging to get large numbers of people to public meetings. In many cases, the public is most likely to turn out when a Hanford issue is in the news (reported accurately or not). It often takes a very concerted effort by agencies and their allies to get people to attend meetings and contribute to productive discussions.
- Agency presenters sometimes seem as though they are not as familiar with material as they could be.
- Ongoing litigation makes the overall climate at some meetings feel less open and inclusive.

### ***Committee Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C)***

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.*

**Q.** If there is enough interest, the agencies are willing to go out to the public and host meetings. However, there have not been many public meetings recently. Why is this?

*R. [EPA] Hanford cleanup is currently not in a place that necessitates many public meetings. Funding is tied up in several large cleanup projects on the RL side, and ORP is focused on DFLAW. There are few actionable projects that are currently ongoing.*

**C.** ORP should use the upcoming years as an opportunity to go out to the public, educate people about DFLAW, and solicit feedback in the process. The TPA agencies should have a proactive plan to gain public support for major initiatives. Regional meetings, such as State of the Site, could be very beneficial for all the TPA agencies, ORP in particular.

*C. Many of the positive experiences that were shared by PIC members were targeted, small group discussion style meetings. State of the Site meetings, as they have been done in the past, are large meetings that are something of a free-for all. There is the opportunity to improve the State of the Site format using provided feedback. The meetings should still happen regionally, and they should still happen in person.*

C. The Board will consider advice on State of the Site meetings at the December 2016 meeting. If the Board adopts that advice, it will be an opportunity to continue discussions on this topic at the February 2017 PIC meeting.

- Liz identified that the existing issue manager group on Public Involvement and Engagement, consisting of herself, Shannon Cram, Helen Wheatley, Susan Leckband, Alissa Cordner, and Gary Garnant, would review the meeting discussion and, potentially, the agency response to the HAB State of the Site advice in advance of the next PIC meeting. Issue managers anticipated further discussion on the topic, and they expected to frame committee meeting discussion on a PIC call in January or February 2017.

### **Tri-Party Agreement Milestone Change Package Response to Comment Summary**

Shannon Cram, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington, shared that the recent public comment period for the TPA Change Package received over 1,500 comments from regional public meetings. She encouraged PIC members to review the comment summary and provide feedback to TPA agency representatives.

Emy Laija, EPA, noted that Ben Vannah, RL, worked very hard to ensure that DOE produced a quality comment response summary for the Central Plateau Change Package effort.

### ***Committee Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C)***

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.*

C. The document is very helpful, and it is organized intuitively. The response to public comment being located at the beginning of the document was very accessible.

C. It was challenging to locate the document through general internet searches, and then through searching the Hanford website. The document itself is very well done, but it should be made easier to locate.

C. Staff at the meetings identified that there is some uncertainty around cleanup in the Central Plateau, and they acknowledged that additional characterization efforts are needed for some areas. This helped to build credibility with the meeting attendees.

C. In some places, more clarity and accuracy in the incorporated language would have been helpful. The meaning was vague or unclear in certain instances.

C. The document could have incorporated a statement that encouraged further comments (e.g. “If you have any additional comments on this issue, please reach out”).

*R. [EPA] The agencies do not incorporate that language, as it would set up the expectation that the Central Plateau Change Packages would undergo another round of comments before being finalized.*

TPA agency representatives thanked PIC members for their comments. Agencies noted that the next large opportunity for public comment will likely be the 100 N Area Proposed Plan; representatives noted that a timeframe for the release of this Proposed Plan was not yet available.

### **HAB Member Self-Assessments**

Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE), said that he participated in a summer tour of the Hanford Site with members of the Oregon legislature and legislative staff, as well as Alex Smith, Ecology. He noted that he attended a ORP speaker’s bureau presentation at a Rotary meeting in Beaverton, Oregon, and provided comments on the overall tone of positivity. Ken also said that Dirk Dunning, ODOE, presented information about Hanford to a group of 58 Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) teachers. The Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board met in September 2016 with good support from the TPA agencies. The product from that meeting was a letter to Maia Bellon, Ecology Director, recognizing support for PPGs. Ken closed by noting that ODOE was updating their website, and he said that it should be live by the end of December 2016.

Steve Hudson, Hanford Watch, said he has noticed a change in the amount of academics requesting presentations on Hanford. He cited changing student priorities and shifting ways that they are looking at completion rates as the reason for this shift.

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge, said that her organization was considering public education strategies that were not time or resource intensive, as Hanford Challenge lost PPG funding in 2016. She was hopeful that the funding would be restored in coming state budgets. Liz also noted that Hanford Challenge had helped to mentor an intern from Whitman College throughout the 2016 summer months, and she noted that Hanford Challenge had a new Board alternate in Nikolas Petersen.

Shannon Cram, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington, said that she was working with the Simpson Center for Humanities at the University of Washington to bring a group of students and faculty members to tour the Hanford Site in spring 2017. Shannon also noted that she has been continuing to work with Tracy Atkins to assist in designing Hanford exhibits for the Manhattan Project National Historical Park. Shannon also noted that she recently participated in a panel on nuclear waste in Barcelona, Spain. Her classes continue to incorporate Hanford into their coursework.

Alissa Cordner, public-at-large, said that she worked on wildfire management near the Hanford Reach over the past summer. She highlighted the firefighters that she worked with did not have much information about the Site.

Susan Leckband, League of Women Voters, said that she recently provided a presentation to a local Rotary Club that was well-received. She also highlighted a voice interview about Hanford that she provided BBC with.

Tom Galioto, public-at-large, said that he recently talked to several different individuals and groups about Hanford public involvement and public engagement. He noted that much of the interested public is composed of individuals who are retired from the Hanford Site.

Sam Dechter, public-at-large, underscored the importance of combatting misinformation in the media about Hanford whenever possible.

Dawn MacDonald, ORP, said she recently worked to educate a group of fourth-graders from Lewis and Clark Elementary School about the Hanford Site.

Jan Catrell, public-at-large, highlighted her recent teaching a course at Bellingham's Academy of Lifelong Learning. She noted that she worked with Ecology to instruct a course on the state of the Hanford Site. Jan said that 18 people, mostly retirees, took the course, and that it was very successful.

Emy Laija, EPA, said that she is continuing to teach an environmental policy course focusing on Hanford—specifically, how CERCLA and RCRA are implemented.

Kris Holmes, RL, said that has been coordinating tours of the Hanford Site as a collateral duty. Kris said that DOE offered 25 tours and had 391 total attendees. She noted that this was a decline from the 2014-2015 season, but also recognized that the B Reactor tours were now offered through the U.S. National Park Service. She said that RL is currently looking for opportunities to enhance the tour experience in the coming season.

Ginger Wireman, Ecology, said that she has been continuing to do presentations throughout the Northwest. She also said that she participated in a STEM event with the Nez Perce Tribe in early December 2016.

Randy Bradbury, Ecology, said that his agency is continuing to work with schools in an effort to enhance Hanford education.

Dieter Bohrmann, North Wind supporting ORP, said that ORP is continuing to focus on STEM outreach, as well, and that the agency has been working with Washington State University and other local education institutes. He said that Steve Pfaff is providing a presentation to a Yakima Rotary Club meeting of approximately 75 individuals in December 2016.

Dennis Faulk, EPA, said that the office has noted interest following the recent Today Show piece on Hanford. Dennis said that he found the story to be misleading.

### **Next Steps**

PIC members planned to hold a committee call in early 2017 to plan the agenda for the next anticipated PIC meeting, scheduled for February 28, 2017. Issue managers for ongoing topics noted that they may request additional coordination calls, as needed, to prepare for upcoming committee discussions.

### **Attachments**

**Attachment 1:** Tri-Party Agreement Agencies Public Involvement Calendar – Fiscal Year 2017  
(December 2016)

**Attachment 2:** Hanford Public Involvement Survey, background and framing questions (December 6, 2016)

**Attachment 3:** Public Involvement Information and Engagement IM Group, background and framing questions

## Attendees

Board members and alternates:

Don Bouchey	Sam Dechter	Liz Mattson
Jan Catrell	Dirk Dunning (phone)	Ken Niles (phone)
Shelley Cimon	Tom Galioto	Jean Vanni
Alissa Cordner	Steve Hudson	Steve Weigman
Shannon Cram	Susan Leckband	Helen Wheatley (phone)

Others:

Dawn MacDonald, DOE-ORP	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Jennifer Copeland, CHPRC
Richard Buel, DOE-RL	Emy Laija, EPA	Dieter Bohrmann, North Wind/DOE-ORP
Kris Holmes, DOR-RL	Randy Bradbury, Ecology	Shintaro Ito, PNNL
	Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
		Brett Watson, EnviroIssues